



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,172	09/30/2003	Yoshitaka Sasaki	243452US0X	1575

22850 7590 08/11/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
1940 DUKE STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

HEINZ, ALLEN J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2653

DATE MAILED: 08/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/673,172	Applicant(s) SASAKI ET AL	
	Examiner A. J. HEINZ	Art Unit 2653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 23-32 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 30 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/30/03&9/1/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

Art Unit: 2653

1. Applicant's election, with traverse, of the Group II invention[Cls.1-22] in Paper dated 6/9/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that there has not been shown sufficient distinctness between the different groupings of the claimed inventions.

This is not found to be persuasive because the method claims contain limitations which are specific thereto and are distinct from the apparatus claims, e.g. the flattening step by polishing in claim 23 is not mirrored in any of the apparatus claims, and moreover the disclosure does not show a nexus between this instant feature and any structural feature in the apparatus claims; and since flattening can be achieved in many different ways such as etching and particulate abrading, the apparatus can be significantly different than that produced by the method.

With the showing of any claim in a grouping being distinct from the claims in the other groupings, sufficient evidence has been shown as to the burden to search other different fields which are not required for all the groupings.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claims 23-32 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, pursuant 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-

Art Unit: 2653

elected invention, the requirement having been traversed in Paper dated 6/9/05.

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The Title should provide a more detailed structural identification of the feature or features which distinguish the invention from the prior art.

The intended results produced by the structural differences can also be part of the content of the Title but should be made subordinate to the structural differences.

The portion of the Title directed to the method should be deleted.

3. The following is a quotation of 37 CFR 1.71(a)-(c):

(a) The specification must include a written description of the invention or discovery and of the manner and process of making and using the same, and is required to be in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art or science to which the invention or discovery appertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same.

Art Unit: 2653

(b) The specification must set forth the precise invention for which a patent is solicited, in such manner as to distinguish it from other inventions and from what is old. It must describe completely a specific embodiment of the process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or improvement invented, and must explain the mode of operation or principle whenever applicable. The best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention must be set forth.

(C) In the case of an improvement, the specification must particularly point out the part or parts of the process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter to which the improvement relates, and the description should be confined to the specific improvement and to such parts as necessarily cooperate with it or as may be necessary to a complete understanding or description of it.

The specification is objected to as failing to provide clear and proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP §608.01(o). The specification is inconsistent with the claimed subject matter, for example, claims 1&12 contain the reference to "first pole portion" however this is not consistent with the first pole portion identified in the specification on page 22 because that structure includes features 212, 213&214 which do not conform to the 'reduced track width' requirement and how it projects from the flat surface of the first magnetic film?

Art Unit: 2653

4. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as directed to subject matter which was not described in the specification in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the invention. See previous paragraph.

5. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The following phrases lack clear antecedent basis within the claim(claims); i.e. either the particularly recited passage fails to be properly introduced prior to its appearance at that point in the claim or the structure recited in the passage is not an inherent part of or component of other previously recited structure:"the space between coil turns"(Cls.1&12; e.g. Cl.1, line 18) and "the upper surfaces"(Cls.1&12; e.g. Cl.12, line 29).

An exhaustive search of indefinite and/or ambiguous language has not been attempted, but only exemplified in the preceding paragraphs. Therefore the applicant is responsible for

Art Unit: 2653

a thorough review of all the claims to make corrections as appropriate.

6. Because of the inconsistencies in, and/or omissions from the specification, the examiner has not been able to fully understand the claimed scope of the instant claims to the extent that a complete search could be carried-out.

Therefore no meaningful application of prior art could be made.

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Clarke shows a similar coil construction to that shown in applicant's figure 3.

8. For a complete response applicant should identify how the claimed structure of his invention defines over **all** the art of record.

Where applicant believes that the art is redundant and/or superfluous relative to the critical aspects of the claimed invention the applicant may simply state so in rebuttal summary.

Art Unit: 2653

9. If applicant has filed an information disclosure statement and this instant office action does not contain an initialed-off copy (or copies) of all such filed IDS's (or at least a comment to the disposition of such IDS'S in the body of the office action itself) applicant should apprise the examiner of such missing documentation [to the IDS's] in response to this office action so that the examiner can take appropriate action to supply same to the applicant.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to A. J. HEINZ whose telephone number is (571) 272-7587. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WILLIAM KORZUCH can be reached on (571)272-7589.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A. J. HEINZ
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2653

